UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/944,696	08/31/2001	Dietrich Charisius	TS1005	2131

23485 7590 01/27/2005

JINAN GLASGOW
300 N. GREENE ST., SUITE 1600
P.O. BOX 2974
GREENSBORO, NC 27401

EXAMINER	
STORK, KYLE R	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/944,696	CHARISIUS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kyle R Stork	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cov r sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 January 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *3-17,28-31 and 38-44* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *3-17,28-31 and 38-44* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *5 March 2002*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the election filed 11 January 2005.

2. Claims 3-17, 28-31, and 38-44 are pending. Claims 3, 13, 28, 38, 41, and 44 are independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 5 March 2002 is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3-10, 13-15, 38, 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boden et al. (US 5930512, patent date1999, hereafter Boden) in further view of Nauckhoff (US 5893128, patent date 1999).

As per independent claim 3, Boden discloses a method in a data processing system having versions of a plan, each reflecting an instance in an edit history, the method comprising the steps of displaying a plan in a sequential manner to simulate animation of the edit history (column 10, lines 30-34: Here, the process model is equivalent to the plan, while animation from the beginning is reflecting the edit history).

Boden fails to specifically disclose storing indications of the versions of the plan. However, Nauckhoff discloses storing indications of the versions of the plan (column 7, lines 26-56: Here, marking the last committed version is storing indications of the version of the plan. Further, because a rollback of the system is possible, an earlier version of the plan must be stored).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Boden's method of displaying a plan with Nauckhoff's method of storing versions of a plan, since it would have allowed a user to graphically view the sequential steps leading up to a version.

As per dependent claim 4, Boden and Nauckhoff disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 3, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Boden further discloses creating a link from the plan to the task (column 2, lines 63-65: Here, a hot link links to the task). Nauckhoff discloses storing a version of the task of the plan (column 7, lines 26-56: Here, a rollback is possible, meaning that beside the current version of the plan, an earlier version must also be present).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Boden and Nauckhoff's method of linking from the plan to the task with Nauckhoff's method of storing versions, since it would have allowed the user to navigate several versions of a plan more easily.

As per dependent claim 5, Boden and Nauckhoff disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 3, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Boden further

discloses the method wherein the versions of the plan reflect an activation of the plan (Figure 5: Here, the "STATUS" of tasks in the work list displays activation of the plan).

As per dependent claim 6, Boden and Nauckhoff disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 5, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Boden further discloses the method wherein the plan comprises a plurality of tasks and the indications of the versions of the plan comprise the states of the tasks (Figure 5: Here, the items listed under "DESCRIPTION" are the plurality of tasks, while the "STATUS" displays the states of the tasks).

As per dependent claim 7, Boden and Nauckhoff disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 6, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Boden further discloses the method wherein the state comprises an unexecuted state (Figure 5: Here, the "READY" and "SUSPENDED" states are equivalent to the unexecuted state.

As per dependent claim 8, Boden and Nauckhoff disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 6, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Boden further discloses the method wherein the state comprises an executing state (Figure 5: Here, the "RUNNING" state is equivalent to the executing state).

As per dependent claim 9, Boden and Nauckhoff disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 6, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Boden further discloses the method wherein the state comprises an executed state (column 7, lines 6-26: Here, the exit state is the equivalent of an executed state).

As per dependent claim 10, Boden and Nauckhoff disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 3, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Boden further

discloses the method wherein the indications of the plan reflect modifications to the plan (column 8, lines 56-61: Here modifications of the plan are translated in order to reflect changes in the plan).

As per independent claim 13, Boden discloses a method in a data processing system having versions of a workflow, each reflecting an instance in an edit history, the method comprising the steps of displaying a workflow in a sequential manner to simulate animation of the edit history (column 10, lines 30-34: Here, the process model is equivalent to the workflow, while animation from the beginning is reflecting the edit history). Boden fails to specifically disclose storing indications of the versions of the workflow. However, Nauckhoff discloses storing indications of the versions of the workflow (column 7, lines 26-56: Here, marking the last committed version is storing indications of the version of the workflow. Further, because a rollback of the system is possible, an earlier version of the workflow must be stored).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Boden's method of displaying a workflow with Nauckhoff's method of storing versions of a workflow, since it would have allowed a user to graphically view the sequential steps leading up to a version.

As per dependent claim 14, Boden and Nauckhoff disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 13, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Boden further discloses creating a link from the workflow to the activity (column 2, lines 63-65: Here, a hot link links to the activity). Nauckhoff discloses storing a version of the activity of the

workflow (column 7, lines 26-56: Here, a rollback is possible, meaning that beside the current version of the workflow, an earlier version must also be present).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Boden and Nauckhoff's method of linking from the workflow to the activity with Nauckhoff's method of storing versions, since it would have allowed the user to navigate several versions of a workflow more easily.

As per dependent claim 15, Boden and Nauckhoff disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 13, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Boden further discloses the method wherein the indications of the workflow reflect modifications to the workflow (column 8, lines 56-61: Here modifications of the workflow are translated in order to reflect changes in the workflow).

As per independent claim 28, Boden discloses the computer-readable medium containing instructions for controlling a data processing system to perform a method, the method comprising the steps of displaying a workflow plan in a sequential manner to simulate the generation of the plans from the workflow (column 10, lines 30-34). Boden fails to specifically disclose retrieving a plurality of plans from a workflow. However, Nauckhoff discloses retrieving a plurality of plans from a workflow (column 4, lines 28-36: Here, plans are retrieved from a database for processing by application programs).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Boden's method of displaying plans with Nauckhoff's method of retrieving plans, since it would have allowed a user to view retrieved plans.

As per independent claim 38, the applicant discloses the data processing system for execution of the method of claim 13. Nauckhoff further discloses a memory device and a secondary storage device (column 4, lines 28-36). Claim 38 is similarly rejected under Boden and Nauckhoff.

As per independent claim 41, the applicant discloses the data processing system for execution of the method of claim 3. Nauckhoff further discloses a memory device and a secondary storage device (column 4, lines 28-36). Claim 41 is similarly rejected under Boden and Nauckhoff.

As per independent claim 44, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 3. Claim 44 is similarly rejected under Boden and Nauckhoff.

6. Claims 11, 16, 30, 39, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boden and Nauckhoff in further view of ls (2000, found on page 7, line 2).

As per dependent claim 11, Boden and Nauckhoff disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 3, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Boden and Nauckhoff fail to specifically disclose the method wherein the versions of the plan are displayed in reverse order. However, ls discloses listing in reverse order (page 2: Here, the –r option reverses the order of sort alphabetically or according to time).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Boden and Nauckhoff's method of displaying

versions with ls's method for reversing the order, since it would have allowed a user to view the plan in an alternative order.

As per dependent claim 16, Boden and Nauckhoff disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 13, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Boden and Nauckhoff fail to specifically disclose the method wherein the versions of the workflow are displayed in reverse order. However, ls discloses listing in reverse order (page 2: Here, the –r option reverses the order of sort alphabetically or according to time).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Boden and Nauckhoff's method of displaying versions with ls's method for reversing the order, since it would have allowed a user to view the workflow in an alternative order.

As per dependent claim 30, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 11. Claim 30 is similarly rejected under Boden, Nauckhoff, and ls.

As per dependent claim 39, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 16. Claim 39 is similarly rejected under Boden, Nauckhoff, and ls.

As per dependent claim 42, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 11. Claim 42 is similarly rejected under Boden, Nauckhoff, and ls.

7. Claims 12, 17, 40, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boden and Nauckhoff in further view of Kumashiro (US 6240395, patent 2001, file 1998).

As per dependent claim 12, Boden and Nauckhoff disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 3, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Boden and Nauckhoff fail to specifically disclose the method wherein the display comprises a Gantt chart. Kumashiro discloses a Gantt chart (column 10. lines 38-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Boden and Nauckhoff's method of displaying a plan with Kumashiro's method of displaying a Gantt chart, since it would have allowed a user to view a representation of time to be spent on a task.

As per dependent claim 17, Boden and Nauckhoff disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 13, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Boden and Nauckhoff fail to specifically disclose the method wherein the display comprises a flow diagram. Kumashiro discloses a flow diagram (column 10. lines 38-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Boden and Nauckhoff's method of displaying a plan with Kumashiro's method of displaying a flow diagram, since it would have allowed a user to view a representation of time to be spent on a task.

As per dependent claim 31, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 12. Claim 31 is similarly rejected under Boden, Nauckhoff, and Kumashiro.

As per dependent claim 40, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 17. Claim 40 is similarly rejected under Boden, Nauckhoff, and Kumashiro.

As per dependent claim 43, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 12. Claim 43 is similarly rejected under Boden, Nauckhoff, and Kumashiro.

8. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boden and Nauckhoff in further view of Garofalakis et al. (1998, hereafter Garofalakis).

As per dependent claim 29, Boden and Nauckhoff disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 28, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Boden and Nauckhoff fail to specifically disclose the medium further comprising the steps of:

- Receiving an indication of a rate of display
- Setting a time period equal to a reciprocal of the rate
- Pausing for the time period before displaying each of the plans

Garofalakis discloses:

- Receiving an indication of a rate of display (column 4, line 60- column 5, line 8: Here, the per stream disk bandwidth requirement is the rate of display)
- Setting a time period equal to a reciprocal of the rate (column 4, line 60- column 5, line 8: Here, this time period is the time period required to retrieve the requested data and is a reciprocal of the display frequency)
- Pausing for the time period before displaying each of the plans (column 4, line 60- column 5, line 8: Here, the time necessary to retrieve the data is the paused time period before display)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Boden and Nauckhoff's medium for retrieving plans with Garofalakis's medium for display, since it would have allowed a user to receive the data based upon the equipment he/she was using.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Gantt charts in Excel: Discloses using Gantt charts in Excel.
- Mohan et al. "Exotica: A Research Perspective on Workflow Management Systems": Disclose workflow management.
- Alonso et al. "Advanced Transaction Models in Workflow Contexts": Discloses workflow models.
- Draper et al. (US 5924096): Discloses a distributed database with update logs.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:00-3:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (703) 308-5465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kyle Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

KRS

Cesar B Paula 1/21/05
CESAR B PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER
AU 2178